

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-15 are pending in the application, of which claims 1 and 8 are independent.

In the Office Action dated January 4, 2006, claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,157,719 ("Wasilewski") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,671,810 ("Jardin"). In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner acknowledged that *Wasilewski* does not show an algorithm "specific of the provider" as claimed, but instead relied exclusively on *Jardin* to show this feature. *Jardin* discloses random selection of an algorithm from a pool of algorithms, and the Examiner contended that this random selection would result in an algorithm "specific of the provider." Office Action, page 2.

In response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 8 to more particularly define the invention. No new subject matter has been added. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 8 may be found, for example, at page 16, paragraph 4 and page 17, paragraph 1.

Applicants submit that amended independent claims 1 and 8 overcome the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, "incorporating by each of said plurality of providers into said digital data streams a respective enabling algorithm generated by the provider and specific of the provider." In contrast, *Jardin*'s random selection of algorithms from a pre-determined pool of algorithms at least fails to show or suggest an algorithm "generated by the provider and specific of the provider," as recited in amended claim 1. Because

the Examiner relied exclusively on *Jardin* to fulfill the deficiencies in *Wasilewski* and *Jardin* fails to do so, the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

The remaining claims are also allowable over the cited art. For example, independent claim 8 has been similarly amended to require an algorithm “generated by the provider” and, therefore, is also allowable over the combination of *Wasilewski* and *Jardin* under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for at least the same reasons stated above. Claims 2-7 and 9-15 depend from independent claims 1 and 8, respectively, and are additionally allowable at least because of their dependence on allowable base claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as amended, are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 28, 2006

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
  
Cathy C. Ding  
Reg. No. 52,820